



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/789,135	02/27/2004	Daryl B. Olander	ORACL-01401US0	9244
23910 7590 06/09/2009 FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108				
EXAMINER				
HEFFINGTON, JOHN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2179				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/789,135

Applicant(s)

OLANDER ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN M. HEFFINGTON

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/11/09, 3/25/09, 1/12/09
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the amendment filed 23 February 2009. Claims 1, 14, 27 and 40 have been amended. Claims 1-40 are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Popp et al. (US 6,249,291 B1) in view of Shildt (Java 2 The Complete Reference, Fifth Edition).

Claims 1, 14, 27 and 40: Popp discloses a method, machine readable medium having instructions stored thereon for accepting a request, comprising:

- a. mapping the request to a control tree factory (column 8, lines 17-22, lines 38-44);
- b. generating a control tree from the factory based on the request wherein the control tree can include at least one control (column 2, lines 34-44, column 10, lines 35-37, column 11, lines 26-35);
- c. advancing the control tree through at least one lifecycle stage based on the request (column 12, lines 26-32);
- d. generating a response wherein the response can be used to render at least a portion of a graphical user interface (GUI) (column 1, lines 43-54, column 8, lines 38-44, column 26, lines 31-35);
- e. wherein the at least one control can represent a graphical element of the GUI, wherein (column 10, lines 35-37, column 2, lines 34-44, column 11, lines 26-35);
- f. the controls of the control tree intercommunicate by raising events in a raise events lifecycle state, wherein (column 26, lines 15-18, lines 47-49, column 23, lines 67, column 24, lines 1-14, column 27, lines 8-12, column 30, lines 45-55, column 31, lines 7-10);
- g. the raise events lifecycle state occurs before a render lifecycle state (column 22, lines 6-14, lines 28-36), wherein;

- h. a raise event method is called to raise events in the raise events lifecycle stage (column 11, lines 26-30, column 29, line 67, column 30, lines 1-2);
- i. an event mechanism (column 5, lines 3-7),
- j. wherein at least some controls are associated with different portions of a displayed page such that an action at a first portion of a page associated with a first control of the control tree causes an event that is received by a second control of the control tree associated with a second portion of the page such that a second action occurs at the second portion of the page (column 26, lines 31-42, lines 51-60) [The request and response objects act as a vehicle for passing information between controls. The request object includes information regarding ... specific areas on a page.]

but does not disclose:

- a. wherein an event mechanism allows controls to register for events that they will raise or listen for;
- b. wherein when an event is raised, all controls in the control tree that have registered to receive it, handle the event.

However, Schildt discloses

- a. wherein an event mechanism allows controls to register for events that they will raise or listen for (page 656, Event Listeners);

- b. wherein when an event is raised, all controls in the control tree that have registered to receive it, handle the event (page 656, Event Listeners).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add

- a. wherein an event mechanism allows controls to register for events that they will raise or listen for;
- b. wherein when an event is raised, all controls in the control tree that have registered to receive it, handle the event,

to Popp because Popp specifically discloses that the Java programming language can be used to implement the invention of Popp (column 7, lines 44-58), and Java offers the delegation event model which defines standard and consistent mechanisms to generate and process events that have the advantage that application logic that processes events is cleanly separated from the user interface logic that generates those events (Schildt: page 654, The Delegation Event Model, paragraph 1).

Claims 2, 15 and 28: Popp and Schildt disclose the method and computer readable of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses the step of generating a control tree from the factory comprises: creating a metadata representation of a control tree; and

constructing the control tree based on the metadata representation (column 10, lines 35-37, column 11, lines 37-45).

Claims 3, 16 and 29: Popp and Schildt disclose the method and computer readable medium of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses: the request one of: an hypertext transfer protocol request (HTTP), simple mail transfer protocol request, an instant messaging request, a request based on a standard protocol; and a request based on a proprietary protocol; and the request originates from one of: a web browser, a instant messaging window, and a process (column 6, lines 49, column 4, lines 12-13).

Claims 4, 17 and 30: Popp and Schildt disclose the method and computer readable medium of claims 1, 14 and 17, and Popp further discloses providing the response to a web browser (column 1, lines 43-54, column 4, lines 12-13, column 26, lines 31-35).

Claims 5, 18 and 31: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27, but do not disclose the control tree is driven through the at least one lifecycle stage by an interchangeable lifecycle component. However, Popp discloses that a client request can result in the invocation of an application in the server domain (column 7, lines 13-14) and that self contained modules, or components, can be accessed to provide additional definition for the web page, wherein the modules can be shared by one or

more web in a single application and/or across multiple applications executing on an application server or any other server (column 8, lines 63-67, column 9, lines 1-3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the control tree is driven through the at least one lifecycle stage by an interchangeable lifecycle component to Popp and Creating a tabbed panel. One could have been motivated to add the control tree is driven through the at least one lifecycle stage by an interchangeable lifecycle component to Popp and Schildt to give flexibility to the implementation of the application and modules that process a client request and specify the manner in which an object tree is traversed to render a web page.

Claims 6, 19 and 32: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27, but do not disclose the at least one control has an interchangeable persistence mechanism. However, Popp discloses that a client request can result in the invocation of an application in the server domain (column 7, lines 13-14) and that self contained modules, or components, can be accessed to provide additional definition for the web page, wherein the modules can be shared by one or more web in a single application and/or across multiple applications executing on an application server or any other server (column 8, lines 63-67, column 9, lines 1-3), and store state information independent of the web page across transactions (abstract, column 12, lines 47-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the at least one control has an interchangeable persistence mechanism to Popp and Creating a tabbed panel. One could have been motivated to

add the at least one control has an interchangeable persistence mechanism to Popp and Creating a tabbed panel in order to offer greater flexibility in implementing the mechanism for storing state of the object tree across multiple transactions.

Claims 7: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 but does not disclose that the at least one control can render itself according to a theme. However Popp discloses that a component can have associated resources (e.g. template, associations, and custom logic) that are owned by that component (column 17, lines 55-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the at least one control can render itself according to a theme to Popp and Schildt. One could have been motivated to add the at least one control can render itself according to a theme to Popp and Schildt in order to offer a user predefined rendering patterns for the components of a web page.

Claims 8, 21 and 34: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses that one of the at least one controls can interact with another of the at least one controls (column 4, lines 7-9, column 11, lines 8-35).

Claims 9, 22 and 35: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses that one of the at least one controls can advance through the at

least one lifecycle stage in parallel with another of the at least one controls (column 2, lines 34-44, column 10, lines 35-37, column 11, lines 26-35, column 12, lines 26-32).

Claims 10, 23 and 36: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses the lifecycle stage is one of: init, load state, create child controls, load, raise events, pre-render, render, save state, unload and dispose; and wherein the lifecycle stage is part of a dynamically configurable lifecycle (column 12, lines 26-32).

Claims 11, 24 and 37: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses the response is one of: an hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) response, a simple mail transfer protocol response, an instant messaging response, a response based on a standard protocol, and a response based on a proprietary protocol (column 6, lines 49).

Claims 12, 25 and 38: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses controls can raise events and respond to events (column 26, lines 15-18, column 27, lines 8-12, column 30, lines 45-55, column 31, lines 7-10).

Claims 13: Popp and Schildt disclose the method of claims 1, 14 and 27 and Popp further discloses the at least one control can be one of: Book, Page, Window, Menu, Layout, Portlet, Theme, Placeholder, Shell, LookAndFeel, Desktop, Body, Footer, Header, Head, Titlebar, ToggleButton, TreeView, TreeViewWithRadioButtons, TextBox, TextArea, Label, Button and Anchor (column 2, lines 41-42).

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN M. HEFFINGTON whose telephone number is (571)270-1696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00 - 5:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMH
6/5/09

/Steven B Theriault/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179